

Attorney's Docket No.: 005306.P019

Patent

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of: Kedefors, et al.

Application No. 09/845,785

Filed: 04/30/2001

For: POLYLINGUAL SIMULTANEOUS  
SHIPPING OF SOFTWARE

Examiner: Not yet assigned

Art Unit: 2165

**RECEIVED**

SEP 05 2003

**GROUP 3600**

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, V.A. 22313-1450

on 08/27/2003

Date

Carla Vignola

Commissioner For Patents  
Alexandria, V.A. 22313-1450

RESUBMISSION OF PETITION TO EXPEDITE EXAMINATION  
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.102

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider advance examination of the present application. The previously submitted petition was dismissed because of the failure to satisfy MPEP § 708.02, Section VIII, items (B) and (E). The Applicants submit that the defects from the previous petition have been corrected in the present request.

A check in the amount of \$130.00 was previously submitted to cover the petition fee in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

Applicants request examination of the present application be expedited on the grounds that the present application is a new application. To the Applicants' knowledge, the application has not received any examination from an Examiner. In the present application filed on April 30, 2001, Applicants present that all claims are directed to a single invention. If the Office determines that all claims presented are not obviously directed to a single invention, applicant will make

an election without traverse and will follow established telephone restriction practice to make such an election if requested to do so.

Applicants have had an International Search Report prepared by way of a Patent Cooperation Treaty filing, using the United States as the International Search Authority. The search covered the following areas:

IPC(7): G06F 9/445,  
US CL: 717/170; 175/177

During the course of the search the following patents and published applications were reported:

U.S. Patent No. 5,917,484 A (Mullaney)  
U.S. Patent No. 6,185,729 B1 (Watanabe et al.)  
U.S. Patent No. 6,092,036 A (Hamann)  
U.S. Patent No. 6,219,632 B1 (Schumacher et al.)

A copy of each reference is cited on an Information Disclosure Statement previously filed on April 14, 2003.

The following references from the search report are deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims of the present application. However, it should be noted that the International Search Report indicated that the references above were provided under category "A" as documents defining the general state of the art which are not considered to be of particular relevance. Furthermore, in a International Preliminary Examination Report conducted by the International Preliminary Examination Authority, the examining authority indicated that applications claims 1-37 were novel and included inventive steps.

The Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 6,185,729 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Watanabe") does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in the claims.

With respect to Claims 1, 18, 34 and 36, Watanabe does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: "concurrently implementing an

internationalization process for the base version of the application,” and “concurrently implementing a localization process for the base version of the application.” Watanabe does not teach either of these limitations. In contrast, Watanabe discloses a system and process for testing multi-byte functionality during the development process of a software program. Watanabe, Col. 4, Lines 41-44. “This is accomplished by providing a multi-byte locale for a single byte language which would act for testing purposes just like a multi-byte locale for a multi-byte language but in which the content was in the content was in the single byte language.” Watanabe, Col. 4, Lines 44-48. Furthermore, these limitations would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art in light of Watanabe. The present claims are directed towards, among other things, the simultaneous delivery of software in multiple languages. In one embodiment, this is done by performing the internationalization and localization steps as the base software is being developed. On the other hand, the invention of Watanabe focuses on the transition from a single byte locale to a multi-byte locale during internationalization and preventing some of the consequent downstream software bugs that are discovered during localization. Watanabe, Col. 4, Lines 23-31. Because Watanabe is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious to derive the above-referenced limitations from Watanabe.

With respect to Claim 17, Watanabe does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: “concurrently identifying any hardcoded strings existing in the application,” and “concurrently translating the user interface code into at least one language different from the base language.” Watanabe does not teach either of these limitations. Identifying hardcoded strings is part of the internationalization process, and translating the user interface code is part of the localization process. As asserted in the previous paragraph, Watanabe does not disclose the broader claim of concurrent internationalization and concurrent localization. Watanabe also does not disclose the narrower limitations referenced above. Furthermore, because Watanabe is not pertinent to the subject matter of

the present Application, it would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of Watanabe to derive the above-referenced limitations.

The rest of the claims are dependent claims and, by definition, incorporate the limitations of their associated independent claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Watanabe does not disclose or suggest the language of the claims of the present Application.

The Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 6,219,632 B1 (hereinafter referred to as "Schumacher") does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in the claims.

With respect to Claims 1, 18, 34 and 36, Schumacher does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: "concurrently implementing an internationalization process for the base version of the application," and "concurrently implementing a localization process for the base version of the application." Schumacher does not teach either of these limitations. In contrast, Schumacher discloses a system that utilizes a hierarchical knowledge representation in order to more efficiently support the translation and management of multiple localities. Schumacher, Col. 1, Lines 57-59. Furthermore, these limitations would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art in light of Schumacher. The present claims are directed towards the simultaneous delivery of software in multiple languages. In one embodiment, this is done by performing the internationalization and localization steps as the base software is being developed. On the other hand, the invention of Schumacher focuses on improving the localization process and providing multiple language support for a user of a software application. Schumacher, Col. 1, Lines 49-54. Because Schumacher is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious to derive the above-referenced limitations from Schumacher.

With respect to Claim 17, Schumacher does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: "concurrently identifying any hardcoded strings existing

in the application,” and “concurrently translating the user interface code into at least one language different from the base language.” Schumacher does not teach either of these limitations. Identifying hardcoded strings is part of the internationalization process, and translating the user interface code is part of the localization process. As asserted in the previous paragraph, Schumacher does not disclose the broader claim of concurrent internationalization and concurrent localization. Schumacher also does not disclose the narrower limitations referenced above. Furthermore, because Schumacher is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of Schumacher to derive the above-referenced limitations.

The rest of the claims are dependent claims and, by definition, incorporate the limitations of their associated independent claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Schumacher does not disclose or suggest the language of the claims of the present Application.

The Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 5,917,484 (hereinafter referred to as “Mullaney”) does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in the claims.

With respect to Claims 1, 18, 34 and 36, Mullaney does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: “concurrently implementing an internationalization process for the base version of the application,” and “concurrently implementing a localization process for the base version of the application.” Mullaney does not teach either of these limitations. In contrast, Mullaney discloses a method and apparatus for configuring system locale in a computer system by presenting a computer user with a multilingual, locale independent, language selection screen. Mullaney, Col. 1, Lines 62-67. After selection of a language option, the computer system will be configured to reawake in the corresponding locale. Mullaney, Col. 2, Lines 30-32. Furthermore, these limitations would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art in light of Mullaney. The present claims are directed towards the

simultaneous delivery of software in multiple languages. In one embodiment, this is done by performing the internationalization and localization steps as the base software is being developed. On the other hand, the invention of Mullaney focuses on providing computer users the option to easily configure a computer system in the language of his choice without having to deal with cryptic codes and foreign prompts. Mullaney, Col. 1, Lines 41-49. Because Mullaney is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious to derive the above-referenced limitations from Mullaney.

With respect to Claim 17, Mullaney does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: “concurrently identifying any hardcoded strings existing in the application,” and “concurrently translating the user interface code into at least one language different from the base language.” Mullaney does not teach either of these limitations. Identifying hardcoded strings is part of the internationalization process, and translating the user interface code is part of the localization process. As asserted in the previous paragraph, Mullaney does not disclose the broader claim of concurrent internationalization and concurrent localization. Mullaney also does not disclose the narrower limitations referenced above. Furthermore, because Mullaney is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of Mullaney to derive the above-referenced limitations.

The rest of the claims are dependent claims and, by definition, incorporate the limitations of their associated independent claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Mullaney does not disclose or suggest the language of the claims of the present Application.

The Applicant respectfully submits that U.S. Patent No. 6,092,036 (hereinafter referred to as “Hamann”) does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in the claims.

With respect to Claims 1, 18, 34 and 36, Hamann does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: “concurrently implementing an

internationalization process for the base version of the application,” and “concurrently implementing a localization process for the base version of the application.” Hamann does not teach either of these limitations. In contrast, Hamann discloses a multi-lingual data processing system including a locality setting identifying a target language into which text is to be translated. Hamann, Col. 2, Lines 14-19. Furthermore, these limitations would not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art in light of Hamann. The present claims are directed towards the simultaneous delivery of software in multiple languages. In one embodiment, this is done by performing the internationalization and localization steps as the base software is being developed. On the other hand, the invention of Hamann focuses on a data processing system having software that can be translated in real time to any one of several predefined target languages. Hamann, Col. 2, Lines 3-7. Because Hamann is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious to derive the above-referenced limitations from Hamann.

With respect to Claim 17, Hamann does not disclose nor suggest the following limitations: “concurrently identifying any hardcoded strings existing in the application,” and “concurrently translating the user interface code into at least one language different from the base language.” Hamann does not teach either of these limitations. Identifying hardcoded strings is part of the internationalization process, and translating the user interface code is part of the localization process. As asserted in the previous paragraph, Hamann does not disclose the broader claim of concurrent internationalization and concurrent localization. Hamann also does not disclose the narrower limitations referenced above. Furthermore, because Hamann is not pertinent to the subject matter of the present Application, it would not have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art with knowledge of Hamann to derive the above-referenced limitations.

The rest of the claims are dependent claims and, by definition, incorporate the limitations of their associated independent claims. Accordingly, the

Applicant respectfully submits that Hamann does not disclose or suggest the language of the claims of the present Application.

None of the references discussed above disclose the limitations as specified above, and as are claimed by Applicants.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application the Examiner is invited to contact John Ward at (408) 720-8300.



Charge Deposit Account


If there are any additional charges in relation to the present communication please charge Deposit Account 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

8/27/03

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Ward  
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300